UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/224,918	01/04/1999	HEATH HUNNICUTT	1001/028C	3147

22801 7590 03/27/2002

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	15

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/224,918	HUNNICUTT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradley Edelman	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 October 2001* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,7-11,14,15,17-25 and 28-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,7-11,14,15,17-25 and 28-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration filed on October 26, 2001. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 14, 15, 17-25, and 28-49 are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In considering claims 1-49, all of the independent claims – 1, 15, 31, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, and 49 – include limitations that were not described in the specification at the time the application was filed. The specification describes two separate processes. One process involves access requests received from users. When a user makes a request to access a resource, the system determines whether the user may obtain access to the resource by checking an access cache. See Specification, p. 16-18; Fig. 5. The other, separate, process involves flushing the cache

if particular access rights or resources have changed. On a regular, periodic basis, the system will check if certain access rights, resources, or access lists have changed, and if they have, the access cache will be flushed of all related access permissions from the cache. See Specification, p. 18-19; Fig. 6. These two processes operate on some of the same data, but they are separate processes that occur independently of each other.

Each of the independent claims essentially combines these two separate steps into a single, if-then-else routine stemming from a single access request. For instance, claim 37 describes that a server first receives a request for a resource, then checks a memory to determine whether certain parameters have changed, then, if the parameters have changed, the cache memory relating to the user and resource is flushed, but if the parameters have not changed, the system goes on to determine whether a similar request has been previously granted and grants access if the determination is affirmative. However, as explicitly stated in the specification, the steps of checking for alterations and flushing the cache occur on a *regular, periodic basis*. These steps occur separately from any access requests, and there is no routine described in the specification that combines these two separate features. As stated above, one process receives access requests and responds accordingly, while the other process periodically checks for resource or access rights alterations and responds to that determination accordingly. On step does not occur as a result of the other, as claimed.

Therefore, because the claims include new matter that was not described in the specification at the time the application was filed, these claims must be canceled from the application, or appropriately corrected.

2. Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In considering claims 1-36 and 41, the independent claims – 1, 15, 31, 35, and 41 – all include language that is indefinite. All of these claims include if-then-else statements that do not logically flow from the preceding claim language. For instance, claims 1 recites the following:

"Checking a first memory . . . to determine:

if [one of three criteria is met], then removing any access permissions from the first memory . . .

else, if the first memory indicates that the user has previously accessed the resource, then providing the user with access to the requested resource."

The step of "determining" should not include within it steps of removing or providing access to a user. Perhaps the result of the determination step would be to provide access, but these claims, as presently worded, actually include the removing and providing steps as part of the determination step. Therefore, claims 1, 15, 31, 35, and 41, and all claims depending therefrom must be canceled from the application or

appropriately corrected. Note: as an example of language that is not indefinite in this respect, see claim 39.

In considering claims 37-40, 42-49, the independent claims – 37, 39, 42, 44, 46, 47, and 49 – include language that is unclear. Each of these claims requires a step of checking if "the user is/was logically present." It is unclear as to how an actual user can be logically present in a cache. Perhaps the claims intended to mean checking if a *representation* of the user is/was present in the cache, as recited in claims 1, 15, 31, and other independent claims. Nonetheless, claims 37, 39, 42, 44, 46, 47, and 49, and all claims depending therefrom, as presently stated are unclear, and must be canceled from the application or appropriately corrected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 7-11, 14, 15, 17, 20-25, and 28-49, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wobber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,642, hereinafter "Wobber").

For the purposes of these claims, Examiner has interpreted the claims as including the two separate functions of (1) authenticating users who have or have not

previously accessed the resources, and (2) flushing the cache of access permissions if particular system settings are altered.

In considering claims 1, 15, and 31, Wobber discloses a system for a computer-implemented method, comprising:

means for checking a first memory (local cache 164) to determine if a user has previously accessed a requested resource on a computer network without performing a file open procedure upon a file which are stored any access permissions of users for access to the resource (col. 7, lines 32-36), upon receipt of an indication from the user to access the resource (col. 7, lines 22-24); and

providing the user with access to the resource if the first memory indicates that the user has previously accessed the resource (col. 8, lines 31-35).

See also, the Abstract and Summary of the invention.

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or when access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access

permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claims 3 and 17, Wobber further discloses that the user is represented in the first memory by a token (Auth ID, col. 7, lines 34-38).

In considering claims 7 and 21, Wobber further discloses that the resource is a file (col. 4, line 21).

In considering claims 8 and 22, Wobber further discloses that the resource is a volume of files (col. 4, line 21).

In considering claims 9 and 23, Wobber fails to explicitly disclose that the resource is a memory device (see col. 4, lines 21-24). However, Examiner takes official notice that it is well known for networking systems to control access to memory devices, as well as for software objects. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the access control system taught by Wobber for

networked memory devices in order to speed up the authorization process for access requests made to such memory devices.

In considering claims 10 and 24, although the system taught by Wobber discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to explicitly disclose storing of the information in the first memory comprising overwriting other information associated with the resource in the first memory. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in a network resource access system that authentication information is often changed and can thus be overwritten. One reason to change authentication information is to prevent tampering of the protected resources. Therefore, given the likelihood of tampering, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to overwrite the token (Auth ID) taught by Wobber with a new token submitted from the user to help prevent security breaches.

In considering claims 11 and 25, although the system taught by Wobber discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose writing a token for the user in the first memory over another token for another user that had last previous access to the resource. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that overwriting information related to access rights in a network system is well known. Examiner takes further official notice that overwriting of data in a cache according to a least-recently-used algorithm is well known. Thus, given these well known network access functions, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

to include the step of overwriting the least-recently-used tokens in the token cache in the system taught by Wobber, in order to open up storage space in the token cache in case the memory has become full.

In considering claims 14 and 28, Wobber further discloses the request from the user indicating an operation to perform with respect to the resource (i.e. access the resource), and further comprising:

checking the first memory (local cache 164) to determine if the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource (col. 7, lines 34-36);

checking a second memory (local cache 160) to determine if the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource if the first memory does not indicate that the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource (col. 7, lines 39-40, 44-45, 48-52);

providing the user with access to the resource if the second memory indicates that the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource (col. 7, lines 50-60); and

storing information in the first memory indicating that the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource if, after checking the second memory, the second memory indicates that the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource (col. 7, lines 58-63).

In considering claim 20, Wobber further discloses authorizing the user by checking a password (Auth ID) provided by the user; associating the token (Principal ID) with the user after authorizing the user; and using the token to check the first memory (col. 8, lines 1-30; col. 7, lines 55-62).

In considering claims 29 and 30, Wobber further discloses:

checking a second memory to determine if the user may access the resource if the first memory does not indicate that the user has previously accessed the resource (col. 7, lines 39-40, 44-45, 48-52);

providing the user with access to the resource if the second memory indicates that the user may access the requested resource (col. 7, lines 50-60); and

storing information in the first memory indicating that the user may access the resource if, after checking the second memory, the second memory indicates that the user may access the requested resource (col. 7, lines 58-63).

In considering claim 32, Wobber further discloses performing a file open procedure upon the file in which are stored any access permissions of users for access to the requested resource to determine if the requesting user may access the requested resource if the memory does not indicate that the requesting user has previously accessed the requested resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22); and

providing the requesting user with access to the requested resource if the requested resource indicates that the requesting user may access the requested resource (col. 8, lines 23-30).

In considering claim 33, Wobber further discloses storing information in the memory indicating that the user has previously accessed the requested resource (col. 8, lines 22-30).

In considering claim 34, Wobber further discloses prior to checking the memory, performing a preliminary memory check to determine of the requesting use has previously accessed the computer network (col. 4, lines 37-65).

In considering claim 35, Wobber further discloses a machine-readable program storage device embodying instructions executable by a computer to perform a method for providing access to a plurality of resources to a plurality of requesting users wherein access to each said resource is controlled by a network server having a network memory, the method comprising:

receiving at the network server a resource request to access a requested resource of said plurality of resources from one said requesting user (col. 4, lines 9-30), wherein:

the network memory has stored therein which of said plurality of requesting users had accessed which of said plurality of resources (col. 7, lines 34-36); and

an access file has stored therein any access permissions of any users for access to the requested resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22);

without opening the access file, checking the network memory to determine if the requesting user had accessed the requested resource (col. 7, lines 34-36); and

if the requesting user had accessed the requested resource, opening the requested resource to provide access to the requesting user (col. 8, lines 31-35).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or when access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current

users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 36, Wobber further discloses when the requesting user had not previously accessed the requested resource:

opening the access file; checking the access file to determine if the requesting user may have access to the requested resource; and if the check is affirmative, then providing said access (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22).

In considering claim 37, Wobber discloses a resource access system comprising:

a network, including a plurality of resources, for transmitting a resource request from a network user with access to the network for access to a requested resource of said plurality of resources (col. 4, lines 9-30); and

a network server (node 102-1), in communication with the network, for:

receiving the resource request (col. 7, lines 22-24);

checking, without opening any of said plurality of resources, whether the network user's resource request had been previously granted (col. 7, lines 34-36); and

granting said access if the check is affirmative (col. 8, lines 31-34).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or when access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 38, Wobber further discloses that granting said access further comprises opening the requested resource for the network user to have said access to the requested resource (col. 8, lines 34-35).

In considering claim 39, Wobber discloses a program for a resource access system, the program being embodied on a computer-readable medium and executed on a server that provides access to resources on a network, the program comprising: a code segment to receive a resource request for access to one said resource from a user having access to the network (col. 7, lines 22-24);

a code segment to check, without opening any of said resources on the network, whether the user had previously been granted access to the requested resource (col. 7, lines 34-36; and

a code segment to grant said access if the check is affirmative (col. 8, lines 31-35).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose code segments for determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or when access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have

changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 40, Wobber further discloses a code segment to open the requested resource for the user of the network to have said access to the requested resource if the check is affirmative (col. 8, lines 34-35).

In considering claim 41, Wobber discloses a method for controlling access to a requested resource on a computer network by a requesting user, the method comprising:

checking a first memory, without opening the requested resource, to determine if the requesting user has previously accessed the network (col. 7, lines 34-36); and

if the requesting user has previously accessed the network:

providing the requesting user with access to the network (col. 8, lines 31-35);

checking a second memory, without opening the requested resource, to determine if the requesting user has previously accessed the requested resource (col. 7, lines 48-52);

if the requesting user has previously accessed the requested resource then providing the requesting user with access to the requested resource (col. 7, lines 52-63); and

if the requesting user has not previously accessed the requested resource then opening the requested resource to determine if the requesting user may access the requested resource and if the requested resource indicates that the requesting user may access the requested resource then providing the requesting user with access to the requested resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the second memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or when access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no

longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 42, Wobber further discloses a resource access determination method comprising: receiving a request for an access to a resource from a user having had said access; and deciding the request affirmatively based upon contents stored in a cache without opening the resource or contacting the user (col. 7, lines 22-24, 30-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or if access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current

users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 43, Wobber further discloses, prior to said receiving: receiving a request for an access to the resource from the user who had not previously accessed the resource; and obtaining any access privileges to the resource of the user without contacting the user (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22; col. 8, lines 38-44).

In considering claim 44, Wobber discloses a resource access determination method comprising:

receiving an initial request for an access to a resource from a user, and obtaining an access privilege of the user to the resource from a cache and without contacting the user (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22; col. 8, lines 38-44); and

if the user had the access privilege to the resource: granting the initial request; receiving subsequent requests for subsequent accesses to the resource from the user; and granting each said subsequent request without: opening the resource; or contacting the user (col. 7, lines 22-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the

requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or if access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 45, Wobber further discloses that granting the initial request further comprises caching the result of said obtaining said access privilege of the user to the resource (col. 8, lines 23-30); and

granting each said subsequent request further comprises comparing each said subsequent request with said cached result of said obtaining said access privilege of the user to the resource (col. 7, lines 34-48).

In considering claim 46, Wobber discloses a resource access determination method comprising: receiving a request for an access to a resource from a user having had said access; and deciding the request affirmatively based upon contents stored in a cache prior to contacting the user and without opening the resource (col. 7, lines 22-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or if access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 47, Wobber discloses in a system where resources are protected by access checks that are performed to confirm that a user meets any requirements for access to a particular resource, and where an access check is performed the first time that the user requests access to the particular resource to confirm that the user meets any requirements for access to the particular resource, a method for determining whether the user should have access to the particular resource (col. 4, lines 9-30; col. 8, lines 1-22), the method comprising:

receiving a request from a user for access to a resource; checking the results of previous access request checks, which results are stored in a memory cache, to determine if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource; if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource, then allowing access to the resource without performing an access check (col. 7, lines 22-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or if access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access

permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

In considering claim 48, Wobber further discloses that the results of previous access request checks are cached in a cache (col. 8, lines 23-30).

In considering claim 49, Wobber discloses in a system where resources are protected by access checks that are performed to confirm that a user meets any requirements for access to a particular resource, where the requirements for each user to access each resource are stored in an access file, where an access check is performed the first time that the user requests access to the particular resource to confirm that the user meets any requirements for access to the particular resource, and where the access check that is performed the first time that the user requests access to the particular resource includes performing a file opening procedure upon the access file to determine the requirements for the user to access the particular resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22), a method for determining whether the user should have access to the particular resource, the method comprising:

receiving a request from a user for access to a resource (col. 7, lines 22-24);

checking the results of previous access request checks, which results are stored in a memory cache, without opening the access file, to determine if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource (col. 7, lines 34-36); and

if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource, then allowing access to the resource without performing an access check (col. 8, lines 31-35).

However, Wobber does not explicitly disclose the steps of determining if (1) the requested resource is altered, or (2) a representation of the user has been removed from the first memory, or (3) any of the access permissions of the user for access to the requested resource are altered; and if any one of those three criteria is satisfied, then removing the relevant access permissions from the memory. Instead, Wobber proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered, or if access permissions have changed is notoriously well known in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of removing access permissions to the resources taught by Wobber not only when the time stamp expires, but also when the resources are altered or access rights have changed, in case the altered resources include classified information which should not be viewed by current users, or the current users have been demoted from classified status and should no longer have access to classified information. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when resources or access permissions are altered.

4. Claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wobber, in view of Carlson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,506,961, hereinafter "Carlson").

In considering claims 4, 5, 18, and 19, although the system taught by Wobber discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the token also represents anonymous users and/or a plurality of other users. Nonetheless, it is well known for multiple users of a networked system to maintain the same tokens (thus remaining anonymous) for user access to a resource, as evidenced by Carlson. In a similar art, Carlson teaches an access rights system that uses tokens to signify access rights of users to a network, wherein single tokens can identify a group of users (thus rendering the users anonymous; col. 8, line 63 – col. 9, line 5). Thus, given the teaching of Carlson, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability of representing multiple users with the same anonymous token to decrease the number of entries and amount of data in the cache, thus speeding up the cache look-up time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to represent a plurality of users in the system taught by Wobber with the same token, as suggested by Carlson.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are not persuasive.

In particular, Applicant contends the following, regarding the previous rejection of claims 12-13 and 26-27 (which have now been incorporated into each of the independent claims):

> In making the obviousness rejection the Office Action substitutes the limitations of Claims 12-13, and 26-27 with Official Notice. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection fails to give proper weight to the limitations, especially since these limitations are missing from the prior art of record. Moreover, these assertions of obviousness are not otherwise supported by way of prior art citation, stated scientific theory, basis for common knowledge in the art, or cited legal precedent.

All of this is true. However, the reason for taking official notice is specifically for the situation that Applicant has stated, i.e., where the assertions of obviousness are not otherwise supported by way of prior art citation, scientific theory, basis for common knowledge in the art, or cited legal precedent. The examiner may take official notice of facts outside of the record which are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being "well-known" in the art. See MPEP 2144.03. Examiner has taken official notice because the claimed steps of checking if a resource or access rights to a resource have been altered, and if so, then removing indications allowing access to the resource, are notoriously well known in the art. For instance, if a corporate server stores access rights regarding the company's employees, and one of the employees leaves the company, it would be customary to remove the system access rights relating to that employee. In another example, if a particular resource,

such as a group printer, is removed from the system, and certain employees had access to that printer, it would be obvious to remove any access rights relating to that printer from the system to get rid of incorrect and extraneous stored information. Or, if an employee is demoted from a manager status to a lower status, and the manager position allows greater access to company information, it would again be obvious to remove the access rights regarding that employee so that the employee can no longer access resources that he or she is no longer privileged to access.

Applicant has not traversed Examiner's assertions of Official Notice, and has not requested that the Examiner supply additional information in support of the statements made regarding Official Notice for any of the claims. To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 711, 713, 60 USPQ 239, 241. Thus, because Applicant has failed to traverse any of Examiner's assertions of Official Notice as presented in the previous office action, the well-known in the art statements made by Examiner in the previous office action are taken to be admitted prior art. See MPEP 2144.03. See also *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record but not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess, can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7201.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-3900.

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BE

March 18, 2002